Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1,3,6-21,23 and 26-43 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 21, 42 and 43 are independent.

Claims 1,3,6-21,23 and 26-43 were rejected.

Claims 1,9,15,19,21,29,35,42 and 43 are amended herein.

Claims 3,7-8,12-14,23, 27-28, and 32-34 are cancelled herein.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that the API comprises a best match selection based on a highest score match count. Support for this amendment may be found at least at page 18, lines18-23 and at page 19, lines 1-19 of the application as filed.

Claims 21, 42 and 43 are similarly amended as claim 1.

No new matter has been added by way of these claim amendments.

Claim Rejections 35 USC 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6-7, 12-16, 18-21, 23, 26-27, 32-36 and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Slaughter, US patent no. 7,458,082. Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections in view of the claim amendments herein and the following remarks.

Claim 1 as amended now recites:

A method for providing dynamic interaction between a pair of application programs by an interface module of a terminal, the pair of applications including a requestor application desiring access to a target application, the method comprising the steps of:

registering access information of the target application, the access information including published access information made available in a data structure for retrieval by the interface module;

receiving an access request by the interface module from the requestor application, the access request including content corresponding to the published access information of the target application;

obtaining an interface component <u>including an application program interface (API)</u> by using the content to search the data structure<u>, the API comprising a best match selection based on a highest score match count</u> ,~~the interface component including an application program interface (API) configured in a language incompatible with the interface module~~;

identifying a plug-in access handler associated with the interface component, the plug-in access handler configured to be specific to the target application and for translating ~~the incompatible language~~ between the API and the interface module; and

employing the interface component by the interface module to satisfy the access request of the requestor application for interaction with the target application.

Applicant respectfully submits that at least the claim 1 (as amended) element of *"obtaining an interface component including an application program interface (API) by using the content to search the data structure, the API comprising a best*

match selection based on a highest score match count" is not disclosed in Slaughter.

Referring to Figure 4 of the application as filed, it is recognized that the registration logic could optionally include associated keywords for the dynamic lookup of the Application 107 and/or associated API 124. When registered with the interaction module 312, the application 107 would lookup all required APIs 124 for other external applications 124 (for both remote and local applications 107) by submitting predefined sets of keywords characterizing these APIs 124. The interaction module 312 runs the lookup, matching submitted keywords with the keyword set of other applications 107 that were submitted upon publication of their access APIs 124 with the interaction module 312 and placed in the corresponding tables 300, 302. The interaction module 312 may utilize different matching algorithms to identify the best match for the requested API 124.

An example algorithm is a keyword match counting that would return the API 124 with the highest score. Other algorithms such as scoring of weighted keywords or a combination match may also be applied. An example is provided at page 19 of the application as filed, showing selection of API 124 using the highest score keyword match count.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits claim 1 as amended herein is patentable in view of Slaughter and, as such, requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 21, 42 and 43 include similar limitations as claim 1, and a corresponding argument applies. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection to these claims be withdrawn for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to the Slaughter reference.

Since the remaining dependent claims depend from one of the above noted independent claims, Applicant submits that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn for at least the same reasons, since none of the cited Slaughter, Loo or Bloch references disclose the claim element discussed above.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Henry Ohab/
Agent for the Applicant
Henry Ohab
Registration No. 45,854

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
Suite 1600, 1 First Canadian Place
100 King Street West
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5X 1G5

TOR_LAW\ 7796882\1